

On quotients of Banach spaces having shrinking unconditional bases

by E. Odell*

Abstract

It is proved that if a Banach space Y is a quotient of a Banach space having a shrinking unconditional basis, then every normalized weakly null sequence in Y has an unconditional subsequence. The proof yields the corollary that every quotient of Schreier's space is c_0 -saturated.

§0. Introduction.

We shall say that a Banach space Y has *property (WU)* if every normalized weakly null sequence in Y has an unconditional subsequence. The well known example of Maurey and Rosenthal [MR] shows that not every Banach space has property (WU) (see also [O]). W.B. Johnson [J] proved that if Y is a quotient of a Banach space X having a shrinking unconditional f.d.d. and the quotient map does not fix a copy of c_0 , then Y has (WU). Our main result extends this (and solves Problem IV.1 of [J]).

Theorem A. *Let X be a Banach space having a shrinking unconditional finite dimensional decomposition. Then every quotient of X has property (WU).*

Of course such an X will itself have property (WU). Furthermore, if (E_n) is an unconditional f.d.d. (finite dimensional decomposition) for X , then (E_n) is shrinking if and only if X does not contain ℓ_1 .

The proof of Theorem A yields

Theorem B. *Let Y be a Banach space which is a quotient of S , the Schreier space. Then Y is c_0 -saturated.*

Y is said to be c_0 -saturated if every infinite dimensional subspace of Y contains an isomorph of c_0 .

Our notation is standard as may be found in the books of Lindenstrauss and Tzafriri [LT 1,2]. The proof of Theorem A is given in §1 and the proof of Theorem B appears in §2. §3 contains some open problems. We thank H. Rosenthal and T. Schlumprecht for useful conversations regarding the results contained herein.

§1. The proof of Theorem A.

* Research partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-8903197.

Let T be a bounded linear operator from X onto Y where X has a shrinking unconditional f.d.d., $(\tilde{E}_i)$. By renorming if necessary we may suppose that $(\tilde{E}_i)$ is 1-unconditional. Y^* is separable and so by a theorem of Zippin [Z] we may assume that Y is a subspace of a Banach space Z possessing a bimonotone shrinking basis, (z_i) . Fix $C > 0$ such that

$$T(CB_a X) \supseteq B_a Y \equiv \{y \in Y : \|y\| \leq 1\} .$$

Recall that $(\tilde{E}_i)$ is a *blocking* of $(\tilde{E}_i)$ if there exist integers $0 = q_0 < q_1 < q_2 < \dots$ such that $\tilde{E}_i = [\tilde{E}_j]_{j=q_{i-1}+1}^{q_i}$ for all i (where $[\dots]$ denotes the closed linear span). Similarly, $\tilde{F}_i = [z_j]_{j=q_{i-1}+1}^{q_i}$ defines a blocking of (z_i) .

Fix a sequence $\varepsilon_{-1} > \varepsilon_0 > \varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2 > \dots$ converging to 0 which satisfies

$$(1.1) \quad \sum_{i=-1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_i < 1/4 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=p}^{\infty} (4i+2)\varepsilon_i < \varepsilon_{p-1} \quad \text{for } p \geq 0 .$$

Then choose $\tilde{\varepsilon}_0 > \tilde{\varepsilon}_1 > \dots$ converging to 0 which satisfies

$$(1.2) \quad 4p\tilde{\varepsilon}_p < \varepsilon_{p+2} \quad \text{for } p \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=p+1}^{\infty} \tilde{\varepsilon}_j < \tilde{\varepsilon}_p \quad \text{for } p \geq 0 .$$

Our first step is the blocking technique of Johnson and Zippin.

Lemma 1.1 ([JZ 1,2]). *There exist blockings $(\tilde{E}_i)$ and $(\tilde{F}_i)$ of $(\tilde{E}_i)$ and (z_i) , respectively, such that if $(\tilde{Q}_i)$ is the sequence of finite rank projections on Z associated with $(\tilde{F}_i)$ then*

$$(1.3) \quad \text{For all } i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } x \in \tilde{E}_i \text{ with } \|x\| \leq C, \text{ we have } \|\tilde{Q}_j T x\| < \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\max(i,j)} \text{ if } j \neq i, i-1 .$$

Roughly, this says that $T\tilde{E}_i$ is essentially contained in $\tilde{F}_{i-1} + \tilde{F}_i$ (where $\tilde{F}_0 = \{0\}$). Let (y''_i) be a normalized weakly null sequence in Y . Choose a subsequence (y''_i) of (y_i) and a blocking (F_i) of $(\tilde{F}_i)$, given by $F_i = [\tilde{F}_j]_{j=q_{i-1}+1}^{q_i}$, such that if $Q_i = \sum_{j=q_{i-1}+1}^{q_i} \tilde{Q}_j$ is the sequence of finite rank projections on Z associated with (F_i) , then

$$(1.4) \quad \|Q_j y'_i\| < \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\max(i,j)} \text{ if } i \neq j .$$

Roughly, y'_i is essentially in F_i . Furthermore we may assume that

$$(1.5) \quad \left\| \sum a_i y'_i \right\| = 1 \text{ implies } \max |a_i| \leq 2 .$$

Let (E_i) be the blocking of $(\tilde{E}_i)$ given by the *same* sequence (q_i) which defined (F_i) , $E_i = [\tilde{E}_j]_{j=q_{i-1}+1}^{q_i}$.

We begin with a sequence of elementary technical yet necessary lemmas.

For $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ we define $Q_I = \sum_{j \in I} Q_j$ and set $Q_\emptyset = 0$.

Lemma 1.2. Let $0 \leq n < m$ be integers and let $y = \sum_{i \notin (n,m)} a_i y'_i$ with $\|y\| = 1$. Then for $j \in (n, m)$, $\|Q_j y\| < \varepsilon_j$ and $\|Q_{(n,m)} y\| < \varepsilon_n$.

Proof. Let $n < j < m$. Then by (1.5), (1.4), (1.2) and (1.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_j y\| &\leq 2 \left(\sum_{i \leq n} \|Q_j y'_i\| + \sum_{i \geq m} \|Q_j y'_i\| \right) \\ &< 2(n\tilde{\varepsilon}_j + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{m-1}) \\ &\leq (2j+2)\tilde{\varepsilon}_j \leq 4j\tilde{\varepsilon}_j < \varepsilon_j \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\|Q_{(n,m)} y\| < \sum_{j \in (n,m)} \varepsilon_j < \varepsilon_n$ by (1.1). ■

Lemma 1.3. Let $0 = p_0 < r_0 = 1 < p_1 < r_1 < p_2 < r_2 < \dots$ be integers and let $y = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i y'_{p_i}$ with $\|y\| = 1$. Then for $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|Q_{[r_{i-1}, r_i)} y - a_i y'_{p_i}\| < \varepsilon_{p_{i-1}-1}.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} &\|Q_{[r_{i-1}, r_i)} y - a_i y'_{p_i}\| \\ &\leq \|Q_{[r_{i-1}, r_i)} \sum_{j \neq i} a_j y'_{p_j}\| + \|Q_{[r_{i-1}, r_i)} a_i y'_{p_i} - a_i y'_{p_i}\| \\ &\text{which by lemma 1.2 is} \\ &< \varepsilon_{r_{i-1}-1} + \|Q_{[1, r_{i-1})} a_i y'_{p_i}\| + \|Q_{[r_i, \infty)} a_i y'_{p_i}\| \\ &< \varepsilon_{r_{i-1}-1} + 2 \sum_{k < r_{i-1}} \|Q_k y'_{p_i}\| + 2\varepsilon_{r_{i-1}} \text{ (by (1.5) and lemma 1.2)} \\ &< \varepsilon_{r_{i-1}-1} + 2(r_{i-1} - 1)\tilde{\varepsilon}_{p_i} + 2\varepsilon_{r_{i-1}} \text{ (by (1.4))} \\ &\leq \varepsilon_{p_{i-1}} + 2p_i\tilde{\varepsilon}_{p_i} + 2\varepsilon_{p_i} < \varepsilon_{p_{i-1}} + 4\varepsilon_{p_i} \text{ (by (1.2))} \\ &< \varepsilon_{p_{i-1}-1} \text{ (by 1.1)}. \end{aligned}$$
■

Lemma 1.4. Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in E_i$ and $\|x\| \leq C$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_j T x\| &< \varepsilon_{\max(i,j)} \text{ if } j \neq i, i-1, \\ \|Q_{[1, i-2]} T x\| &< \varepsilon_{i-1} \text{ and } \|Q_{[i, \infty)} T x\| < \varepsilon_{i-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $x = \sum_{\ell \in (q_{i-1}, q_i]} \omega_\ell$ with $\omega_\ell \in \tilde{E}_\ell$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Q_j Tx\| &\leq \sum_{k \in (q_{j-1}, q_j]} \sum_{\ell \in (q_{i-1}, q_i]} \|\tilde{Q}_k T\omega_\ell\| \\
(\text{if } j < i-1) : &< \sum_{k \in (q_{j-1}, q_j]} \sum_{\ell \in (q_{i-1}, q_i]} \tilde{\varepsilon}_\ell \text{ (by (1.4))} \\
&< q_j \tilde{\varepsilon}_{q_{i-1}} < q_{i-1} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{q_{i-1}} < \varepsilon_{q_{i-1}+2} < \varepsilon_i \text{ using (1.2)} \\
(\text{if } j > i) : &< \sum_{k \in (q_{j-1}, q_j]} \sum_{\ell \in (q_{i-1}, q_i]} \tilde{\varepsilon}_k \\
&< \sum_{k \in (q_{j-1}, q_j]} q_i \tilde{\varepsilon}_k \leq q_i \tilde{\varepsilon}_{q_{j-1}} \\
&\leq q_{j-1} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{q_{j-1}} < \varepsilon_{q_{j-1}+2} \leq \varepsilon_{j+1} < \varepsilon_j .
\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\|Q_{[1, i-2]} Tx\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{i-2} \|Q_k Tx\| < \sum_{k=1}^{i-2} \varepsilon_i = (i-2)\varepsilon_i < \varepsilon_{i-1}$$

and

$$\|Q_{[i, \infty)} Tx\| \leq \sum_{k=i}^{\infty} \|Q_k Tx\| < \sum_{k=i}^{\infty} \varepsilon_k < \varepsilon_{i-1} . \quad \blacksquare$$

Lemma 1.5. Let $\|x\| \leq C$, $x = \sum_{k \neq j, j+1} \omega_k$ where $\omega_k \in E_k$ for all k . Then

$$\|Q_j Tx\| < \varepsilon_{j-1} .$$

Proof. By lemma 1.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Q_j Tx\| &\leq \sum_{k \neq j, j+1} \|Q_j T\omega_k\| < \sum_{k < j} \varepsilon_j + \sum_{k > j+1} \varepsilon_k \\
&< (j-1)\varepsilon_j + \varepsilon_j = j\varepsilon_j < \varepsilon_{j-1} . \quad \blacksquare
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1.6. Let $1 \leq n < m$ and $x = \sum \omega_j$, $\|x\| \leq C$, with $\omega_j \in E_j$ for all j . Suppose that $\|Q_j Tx\| < 2\varepsilon_{j-1}$ for $n < j < m$. Let $a_{j-1} = Q_{j-1} T\omega_j$ and $b_j = Q_j T\omega_j$. Then

a) $\|a_j + b_j\| < 3\varepsilon_{j-1}$ for $n < j < m$ and

b) $\|\sum_{j \in (r, s]} T\omega_j - (a_r + b_s)\| < 5\varepsilon_{r-1}$ if $n < r < s < m$.

Proof. a) Let $n < j < m$. By lemma 1.5, $\|Q_j Tx - (a_j + b_j)\| = \|Q_j(\sum_{i \neq j, j+1} T\omega_i)\| < \varepsilon_{j-1}$.

Since $\|Q_j Tx\| < 2\varepsilon_{j-1}$, a) follows.

b) Let $n < r < s < m$ and let $j \in (r, s]$. Then $T\omega_j = a_{j-1} + b_j + \gamma_j$ where $\|\gamma_j\| < 2\varepsilon_{j-1}$ by lemma 1.4. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{r+1}^s T\omega_j - (a_r + b_s) \right\| \\
& \leq \|a_r + b_{r+1} + a_{r+1} + b_{r+2} + \cdots + a_{s-1} + b_s - (a_r + b_s)\| + \sum_{j=r+1}^s 2\varepsilon_{j-1} \\
& < \sum_{r+1}^{s-1} \|a_j + b_j\| + 2\varepsilon_{r-1} \\
& < \sum_{r+1}^{s-1} 3\varepsilon_{j-1} + 2\varepsilon_{r-1} \text{ (by a)} \\
& < 5\varepsilon_{r-1} .
\end{aligned}$$

We next come to the key lemma. Let (P_j) be the sequence of finite rank projections on X associated with (E_j) . For $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, we let $P_I = \sum_{i \in I} P_i$.

notation: If $x = \sum x_j \in X$ with $x_j \in E_j$ for all j and $\bar{x} \in X$, we define

$$\bar{x} \preceq x \text{ if } \bar{x} = \sum a_j x_j \text{ with } 0 \leq a_j \leq 1 \text{ for all } j .$$

Lemma 1.7. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m > n + 1$, such that whenever $x \in CBaX$ with $\|Q_j T x\| < 2\varepsilon_{j-1}$ for all $j \in (n, m)$ then: there exists $\bar{x} \preceq x$ with*

- 1) $\|Tx - T\bar{x}\| < \varepsilon$ and
- 2) $P_r \bar{x} = 0$ for some $r \in (n, m)$.

Remark. Lemma 1.7 is the main difference between our result and Johnson's earlier special case [J]. In the case where T does not fix a copy of c_0 , Johnson showed that one could take $\bar{x} = x - P_r(x)$ for some $r \in (n, m)$.

The proof of lemma 1.7 requires the following key

Sublemma 1.8. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists an integer $m = m(n, \varepsilon) > n + 1$ satisfying the following. Let $x \in CBaX$, $x = \sum \omega_j$ with $\omega_j \in E_j$ for all j . Assume in addition that $\|Q_j T x\| < 2\varepsilon_{j-1}$ for $j \in (n, m)$ and set $a_{j-1} = Q_{j-1} T \omega_j$ and $b_j = Q_j T \omega_j$. Then there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and integers $n < i_1 < \cdots < i_k < m$ such that*

$$(1.6) \quad k^{-1} \|a_{i_1} + a_{i_2} + \cdots + a_{i_k}\| < \varepsilon .$$

Proof of Lemma 1.7. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose $n_0 \geq n$ such that

$$(1.7) \quad \varepsilon_{n_0} < \varepsilon/12 .$$

Let $m_1 = m(n_0 + 1, \varepsilon/3)$ be given by the sublemma and let $m = m(m_1, \varepsilon/3)$.

Let $x = \sum \omega_j \in CBaX$ with $\omega_j \in E_j$ for all j and suppose that $\|Q_j T x\| < 2\varepsilon_{j-1}$, $a_{j-1} = Q_{j-1} T \omega_j$ and $b_j = Q_j T \omega_j$ for $j \in (n, m)$. By our choice of m there exist integers k and K and integers $n \leq n_0 < n_0 + 1 < i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k < m_1 < j_1 < \dots < j_K < m$ such that

$$(1.8) \quad k^{-1} \|a_{i_1} + \dots + a_{i_k}\| < \varepsilon/3 \text{ and}$$

$$(1.9) \quad K^{-1} \|a_{j_1} + \dots + a_{j_K}\| < \varepsilon/3 .$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x} = & \sum_1^{i_1} \omega_j + \frac{k-1}{k} \sum_{i_1+1}^{i_2} \omega_j + \dots + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i_{k-1}+1}^{i_k} \omega_j + \frac{0}{k} \sum_{i_k+1}^{j_1} \omega_j \\ & + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j_1+1}^{j_2} \omega_j + \dots + \frac{K}{K} \sum_{j_{K-1}+1}^{\infty} \omega_j . \end{aligned}$$

Clearly (2) holds and we are left to check (1).

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tx - T\bar{x}\| = & \left\| \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i_1+1}^{i_2} T\omega_j + \frac{2}{k} \sum_{i_2+1}^{i_3} T\omega_j \right. \\ & + \dots + \frac{k}{k} \sum_{i_k+1}^{j_1} T\omega_j + \frac{K-1}{K} \sum_{j_1+1}^{j_2} T\omega_j + \dots + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j_{K-1}+1}^{j_K} T\omega_j \left. \right\} . \end{aligned}$$

Thus by lemma 1.6,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tx - T\bar{x}\| \leq & \left\| \frac{1}{k} a_{i_1} + \frac{1}{k} b_{i_2} + \frac{2}{k} a_{i_2} + \frac{2}{k} b_{i_2} \right. \\ & + \dots + \frac{k}{k} a_{i_k} + \frac{K}{K} b_{j_1} + \frac{K-1}{K} a_{j_1} + \frac{K-1}{K} b_{j_2} + \dots + \frac{1}{K} a_{j_{K-1}} + \frac{1}{K} b_{j_K} \left. \right\} \\ & + k^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^k 5j\varepsilon_{i_{j-1}} + K^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^K 5\ell\varepsilon_{j_{\ell-1}} . \end{aligned}$$

Now $k^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^k 5j\varepsilon_{i_{j-1}} \leq 5 \sum_{j=1}^k \varepsilon_{i_{j-1}} < \varepsilon_{i_1-2} \leq \varepsilon_{n_0}$ and $K^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^K 5\ell\varepsilon_{j_{\ell-1}} < \varepsilon_{n_0}$ as well.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tx - T\bar{x}\| & < k^{-1} \|a_{i_1} + \dots + a_{i_k}\| + K^{-1} \|b_{j_1} + \dots + b_{j_K}\| \\ & + k^{-1} \sum_{j=2}^k \|b_{i_j} + a_{i_j}\| + K^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{K-1} \|b_{j_\ell} + a_{j_\ell}\| + 2\varepsilon_{n_0} . \end{aligned}$$

From (1.8), (1.9) and lemma 1.6 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tx - T\bar{x}\| & < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \sum_{j=2}^k 3\varepsilon_{i_{j-1}} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{K-1} 3\varepsilon_{j_{\ell-1}} + 2\varepsilon_{n_0} \\ & < \frac{2\varepsilon}{3} + \varepsilon_{n_0} + \varepsilon_{n_0} + 2\varepsilon_{n_0} < \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

(by (1.7)). ■

Proof of Sublemma 1.8. If the sublemma fails then by a standard compactness argument we obtain $\omega_j \in E_j$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all m ,

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \omega_j \right\| \leq C \text{ and } \left\| Q_j T \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \omega_i \right) \right\| \leq 3\varepsilon_{j-1}$$

if $n < j < m$. The extra ε_{j-1} comes from an application of lemma 1.5. Furthermore setting $Q_{j-1}T\omega_j = a_j$ and $Q_jT\omega_j = b_j$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, then for all k and all $n < i_1 < \dots < i_k$ we have

$$(1.10) \quad k^{-1} \|a_{i_1} + \dots + a_{i_k}\| \geq \varepsilon .$$

Now $a_j \in F_j$ and (F_j) is a shrinking f.d.d. Thus $(a_j)_{j>n}$ is a seminormalized weakly null sequence. By (1.10) any spreading model of a subsequence of (a_j) must be equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 (see [BL] for basic information on spreading models). In particular we can choose an even integer k and integers $n < i_1 < \dots < i_k$ such that

$$(1.11) \quad \|a_{i_1} - a_{i_2} + \dots + a_{i_{k-1}} - a_{i_k}\| > C\|T\| + 1 .$$

However,

$$\begin{aligned} C\|T\| &\geq \|T(\sum_{i_1+1}^{i_2} \omega_j + \sum_{i_3+1}^{i_4} \omega_j + \dots + \sum_{i_{k-1}+1}^{i_k} \omega_j)\| \\ &\geq \|a_{i_1} + b_{i_2} + a_{i_3} + b_{i_4} + \dots + a_{i_{k-1}} + b_{i_k}\| \\ &\quad - 5 \sum_{j=1}^k \varepsilon_{i_j-1} \text{ (by lemma 1.6) .} \end{aligned}$$

Now $5 \sum_{j=1}^k \varepsilon_{i_j-1} < \varepsilon_{i_1-2}$ and by lemma 1.6 and (1.11)

$$\begin{aligned} &\|a_{i_1} + b_{i_2} + \dots + a_{i_{k-1}} + b_{i_k}\| \\ &\geq \|a_{i_1} - a_{i_2} + a_{i_3} - a_{i_4} + \dots + a_{i_{k-1}} - a_{i_k}\| \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^{k/2} \|a_{i_{2j}} + b_{i_{2j}}\| > C\|T\| + 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{k/2} 3\varepsilon_{i_{2j}-1} . \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} C\|T\| &> C\|T\| + 1 - \varepsilon_{i_1-2} - \varepsilon_{i_2-2} \\ &\geq C\|T\| + 1 - 2\varepsilon_{i_1-2} > C\|T\| , \end{aligned}$$

which is impossible. ■

Completion of the proof of Theorem A.

Let the integer m given by lemma 1.7 be denoted by $m = m(n; \varepsilon)$. Choose $1 < p_1 < p_2 < \dots$ such that for all i , $p_{i+1} - 1 \geq m(p_i; \varepsilon_{p_i})$. Let $(y_i) = (y'_{p_i})$. We shall prove that (y_i) is unconditional.

Let $y = \sum a_i y_i$, $\|y\| = 1$, $x \in CBaX$, $Tx = y$ and let $x = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} g_i$ where $g_0 = P_{[1, p_1)} x$ and $g_i = P_{[p_i, p_{i+1})} x$ for $i \geq 1$. We shall apply lemma 1.7 to each g_i for $i \geq 1$. Fix $i \geq 1$ and let $(n, m) = (p_i, p_{i+1} - 1)$. Let $j \in (n, m)$. Then $\|Q_j y\| < \varepsilon_j$ by lemma 1.2. Thus $\|Q_j Tx\| = \|Q_j Tg_i + Q_j T \sum_{k \neq i} g_k\| < \varepsilon_j$. However $\|Q_j T \sum_{k \neq i} g_k\| < \varepsilon_{j-1}$ by lemma 1.5 so $\|Q_j Tg_i\| < \varepsilon_{j-1} + \varepsilon_j < 2\varepsilon_{j-1}$. Thus by lemma 1.7 there exist $\bar{g}_i \preceq g_i$ and $r_i \in (p_i, p_{i+1} - 1)$ such that $P_{r_i} \bar{g}_i = 0$ and $\|Tg_i - T\bar{g}_i\| < \varepsilon_{p_i}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $\bar{x} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \bar{g}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \bar{x}_i$ where $\bar{g}_0 = g_0$ and $\bar{x}_i = P_{[r_{i-1}, r_i)} \bar{x}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ($r_0 = 1$). Of course, $\bar{x}_i = P_{(r_{i-1}, r_i)} \bar{x}$ if $i > 1$.

Claim: $\|T\bar{x}_i - a_i y_i\| < 4\varepsilon_{p_{i-1}-1}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Indeed $\|Q_{[r_{i-1}, r_i)} y - a_i y_i\| < \varepsilon_{p_{i-1}-1}$ by lemma 1.3. Thus the claim follows from the

Subclaim: $\|Q_{[r_{i-1}, r_i)} Tx - T\bar{x}_i\| < 3\varepsilon_{p_{i-1}-1}$.

To see this we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|Q_{[r_{i-1}, r_i)} Tx - Q_{[r_{i-1}, r_i)} T(g_{i-1} + g_i + g_{i+1})\| \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in [r_{i-1}, r_i)} \|Q_k \sum_{j \neq i-1, i, i+1} Tg_j\| \\ & < \sum_{k \in [r_{i-1}, r_i)} \varepsilon_{k-1} \quad (\text{by lemma 1.5}) \\ & < \varepsilon_{r_{i-1}-1} . \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} & \|Q_{[r_{i-1}, r_i)} T(g_{i-1} + g_i + g_{i+1}) - Q_{[r_{i-1}, r_i)} T(\bar{g}_{i-1} + \bar{g}_i + \bar{g}_{i+1})\| \\ & \leq \|T(g_{i-1} + g_i + g_{i+1} - \bar{g}_{i-1} - \bar{g}_i - \bar{g}_{i+1})\| \\ & < \varepsilon_{p_{i-1}} + \varepsilon_{p_i} + \varepsilon_{p_{i+1}} < \varepsilon_{p_{i-1}-1} . \end{aligned}$$

Finally, applying lemma 1.5 again we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|Q_{[r_{i-1}, r_i)} [T(\bar{g}_{i-1} + \bar{g}_i + \bar{g}_{i+1}) - T(\bar{x}_i)]\| \\ & < \varepsilon_{r_{i-1}-1} , \text{ and the subclaim follows .} \end{aligned}$$

Let $\delta_i = \pm 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sum \delta_i a_i y_i\| & \leq \|\sum \delta_i (a_i y_i - T\bar{x}_i)\| \\ & + \|\sum \delta_i T\bar{x}_i\| \\ & < \sum 4\varepsilon_{p_{i-1}-1} + \|T\| \|\sum \delta_i \bar{x}_i\| \\ & \quad (\text{by the claim}) \\ & \leq 1 + C\|T\| . \end{aligned}$$

■

The proof of Theorem A yields the following

Proposition 1.9. *Let X have a shrinking K -unconditional f.d.d. (E_i) and let T be a bounded linear operator from X onto Y . Let $T(CBaX) \supseteq BaY$. Then if $\varepsilon_i \downarrow 0$ and if (y'_i) is a normalized weakly null basic sequence in Y there exists a subsequence (y_i) of (y'_i) and integers $p_1 < p_2 < \dots$ with the following property. Let $\|\sum a_i y_i\| \leq 2$. Then there exists $x = \sum x_i \in 2CKBaX$, (x_i) a block basis of (E_i) , such that*

$$\|Tx_i - a_i y_i\| < \varepsilon_i \quad \text{for all } i.$$

Moreover there exist (r_i) with $0 = r_0 < p_1 < r_1 < p_2 < r_2 < \dots$ such that $x_i \in [E_j]_{j \in (r_{i-1}, r_i)}$ for all i .

Corollary 1.10. *Let X have a shrinking K -unconditional f.d.d. and let T be a bounded linear operator from X onto the Banach space Y . Then Y contains c_0 if and only if T fixes a copy of c_0 .*

Proof. If Y contains c_0 then there exists (see [Ja]) (y_i) , a normalized sequence in Y , with $2^{-1} \leq \|\sum a_i y_i\| \leq 2$ if $(a_i) \in S_{c_0}$, the unit sphere of c_0 . Let $\varepsilon_i \downarrow 0$ with $\sum \varepsilon_i < 1$. We may assume that (y_i) satisfies the conclusion of proposition 1.9. Thus for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist

$$0 = r_0^n < p_1 < r_1^n < p_2 < r_2^n < \dots$$

and $x_i^n \in [E_j]_{j \in (r_{i-1}^n, r_i^n)}$ such that if $x^n = \sum_{i \leq n} x_i^n$, then $\|x^n\| \leq 2CK$ and $\|Tx_i^n - y_i\| < \varepsilon_i$ for $i \leq n$.

By passing to a subsequence (x^{n_k}) we may assume $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} r_i^{n_k} = r_i$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_i^{n_k} = x_i$ exist for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $x_i \in [E_j]_{j \in (r_{i-1}, r_i)}$ with $r_0 = 0 < r_1 < r_2 < \dots$, $\|Tx_i - y_i\| < \varepsilon_i$ for all i and $\sup_n \|\sum_1^n x_i\| < \infty$. It follows that (x_i) is equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0 . Moreover if we choose $\omega_i \in \varepsilon_i CBaX$ with $T\omega_i = y_i - Tx_i$ then $T(x_i + \omega_i) = y_i$ and some subsequence of $(x_i + \omega_i)$ is also a c_0 basis. Hence T fixes c_0 . ■

§2. The proof of Theorem B.

We begin by recalling the definition of the Schreier space S [S]. Let c_{00} be the linear space of all finitely supported real valued sequences. For $x = (x_i) \in c_{00}$ set

$$\|x\| = \max_i \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^p |x_{k_i}| : p \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } p \leq k_1 < \dots < k_p \right\}.$$

S is the completion of $(c_{00}, \|\cdot\|)$. We let $\|x\|_0$ denote the c_0 -norm of x . The unit vector basis (e_n) is a shrinking 1-unconditional basis for S . S can be embedded into $C(\omega^\omega)$ and thus S is c_0 -saturated.

Theorem B will follow from a quantitative version, Theorem B' (below). Given a sequence (x_n) , $\lambda > 0$ and F a finite nonempty subset of $\mathbb{N}$, $y = \lambda \sum_{n \in F} x_n$ is said to be a *1-average* of (x_n) . We say that a Banach space X has property- $S(1)$ if every normalized weakly null sequence in X admits a block basis of 1-averages which is equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0 . S has property- $S(1)$.

Theorem B'. *Let Y be a quotient of S . Then Y has property- $S(1)$.*

We shall use the following simple

Lemma 2.1. *Let (x_n) be a normalized weakly null sequence in S with $\lim_n \|x_n\|_0 = 0$. Then some subsequence of (x_n) is equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0 .*

Let T be a bounded linear operator from S onto a Banach space Y and let (y'_i) be a normalized weakly null basic sequence in Y . Let $T(CBaS) \supseteq BaY$.

Lemma 2.2. *If no block basis of 1-averages of (y'_i) is equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0 , then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $x \in 3CBaS$, Tx is a 1-average of (y'_i) and $\|Tx\| > 1/3$ then $\|x\|_0 > \delta$.*

Proof. If no such δ exists then there exists $(x_i) \subseteq 3CBaS$ with $\lim_i \|x_i\|_0 = 0$, $\|Tx_i\| > \frac{1}{3}$ and Tx_i a 1-average of (y'_i) for all i . By lemma 2.1 there exists a subsequence (x'_i) of (x_i) which is equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0 . By passing to a further subsequence we may assume that (Tx'_i) is a seminormalized weakly null basic sequence in $[(y'_i)]$. Thus (Tx'_i) is also equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0 . ■

Proof of Theorem B'. Let (y'_i) be a normalized weakly null sequence in Y . If (y'_i) fails the $S(1)$ property, choose $\delta > 0$ by lemma 2.1. Let $(\varepsilon_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of positive numbers satisfying

$$(2.1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_i < \min(\delta/(2C), 1) .$$

Let (y_i) be the subsequence of (y'_i) given by proposition 1.9 for the sequence (ε_i) . Choose an even integer $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$(2.2) \quad m > 8C/\delta .$$

From the theory of spreading models there exists $(z_i)_{i=1}^{2m}$, a finite subsequence of (y_i) , such that setting $\lambda = \|\sum_{i=1}^{2m} z_i\|^{-1}$,

$$(2.3) \quad 2 > \lambda \left\| \sum_{i \in F} z_i \right\| > 1/3 .$$

whenever $F \subseteq \{1, \dots, 2m\}$ with $|F| \geq m$.

Thus there exists $x = \sum_{i=1}^{2m} x_i \in 2CBaS$ with (x_i) a block basis of (e_i) and $\|Tx_i - \lambda z_i\| < \varepsilon_i$ for $i \leq 2m$. For $i \leq 2m$ choose $\omega_i \in S$ with $T\omega_i = \lambda z_i - Tx_i$ and $\|\omega_i\| \leq C\varepsilon_i$. Hence $T(x_i + \omega_i) = \lambda z_i$.

Since $\|T(\sum_{i=1}^{2m} (x_i + \omega_i))\| > 1/3$, and

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{2m} (x_i + \omega_i) \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{2m} x_i \right\| + \sum_{i=1}^{2m} \|\omega_i\| < 2C + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_i C < 3C ,$$

by lemma 2.2 we have $\|\sum_{i=1}^{2m} (x_i + \omega_i)\|_0 > \delta$. Since $\|\sum_{i=1}^{2m} \omega_i\|_0 \leq \|\sum_{i=1}^{2m} \omega_i\| < \delta/2$ by (2.1) there exists $i_1 \leq 2m$ with $\|x_{i_1}\|_0 > \delta/2$.

Now

$$\|T(\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i_1}}^{2m} (x_i + \omega_i))\| = \|\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i_1}}^{2m} \lambda z_i\| > \frac{1}{3}$$

and so we may repeat the argument above finding $i_2 \neq i_1$ with $\|x_{i_2}\|_0 > \delta/2$. In fact by (2.3) we can repeat this m -times obtaining distinct integers $(i_k)_{k=1}^m \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, 2m\}$ with $\|x_{i_k}\|_0 > \delta/2$ for $k \leq m$. But then $2C \geq \|x\| = \|\sum_{i=1}^{2m} x_i\| \geq \|\sum_{k=1}^m x_{i_k}\| \geq \sum_{k=\frac{m}{2}+1}^m \|x_{i_k}\|_0 \geq \delta m/4$ which contradicts (2.2). ■

§3. Open Problems

Our work suggests a number of problems, of which we list a few. For a more extensive list of related problems and an overview of the current state of infinite dimensional Banach space theory, see [R].

Problem 1. Let X be a Banach space having property (WU) which does not contain ℓ_1 and let Y be a quotient of X . Does Y have property (WU)?

In light of Theorem A it is worth noting that $C(\omega^\omega)$ has property (WU) [MR] but does not embed into any space having a shrinking unconditional f.d.d. In fact $C(\omega^\omega)$ is not even a subspace of a quotient of such a space. Indeed $C(\omega^\omega)$ fails property (U) (see *e.g.* [HOR]) while any quotient of a space with a shrinking unconditional f.d.d. will have property (U). In fact if X has property (U) and does not contain ℓ_1 , then any quotient of X will have property (U) [R]. The next problem is due to H. Rosenthal.

Problem 2. Let X have a shrinking unconditional f.d.d. and let Y be a quotient of X . Does Y embed into a Banach space having a shrinking unconditional f.d.d.?

We say that a Banach space Y has uniform-(WU) if there exists $K < \infty$ such that every normalized weakly null sequence in Y has a K -unconditional subsequence. Our proof of Theorem A showed that the quotient space Y has uniform-(WU).

Problem 3. If Y has property (WU) does Y have uniform-(WU)?

Theorem B solved a special case of the following well known problem.

Problem 4. Let Y be a quotient of $C(\omega^\omega)$ (or more generally $C(K)$ where K is a compact countable metric space). Is Y c_0 -saturated?

Regarding this problem, T. Schlumprecht [Sc] has observed that if Y is a quotient of $C(\omega^\omega)$, then the closed linear span of any normalized weakly null sequence in Y which has ℓ_1 as a spreading model must contain c_0 .

It is not true that the quotient of a c_0 -saturated space must also be c_0 -saturated. The separable Orlicz function space $H_M(0, 1)$, with $M(x) = (e^{x^4} - 1)/(e - 1)$, considered in [CKT] is c_0 -saturated and yet has ℓ_2 as a quotient. We wish to thank S. Montgomery-Smith for bringing this fact to our attention. However this space does not have an unconditional basis and so we ask

Problem 5. Let X be a c_0 -saturated space with an unconditional basis and let Y be a quotient of X . Is Y c_0 -saturated?

A more restricted and perhaps more accessible question is the following

Problem 6. Let Y be a quotient of S_n , the n^{th} -Schreier space, where $n \geq 2$. Is Y c_0 -saturated? Does Y have property- $S(n)$?

S_n is defined as follows. Let $\|x\|_1$ be the Schreier norm. If $(S_n, \|\cdot\|_n)$ has been defined, set for $x \in c_{00}$, the finitely supported real sequences,

$$\|x\|_{n+1} = \max\left\{\sum_{k=1}^p \|E_k x\|_n : p \leq E_1 < E_2 < \cdots < E_p\right\}.$$

(Here $p \leq E_1$ means $p \leq \min E_1$ and $E_1 < E_2$ means $\max E_1 < \min E_2$. Also $Ex(i) = x(i)$ if $i \in E$ and 0 otherwise.) S_{n+1} is the completion of $(c_{00}, \|\cdot\|_{n+1})$. The unit vector basis (e_n) is a 1-unconditional shrinking basis for every S_n and S_n embeds into $C(\omega^{\omega^n})$.

Property- $S(n)$ is defined as follows. n -averages of a sequence (y_m) are defined inductively: an $n+1$ -average of (y_m) is a 1-average of a block basis of normalized n -averages. Y has *property- $S(n)$* if every normalized weakly null basic sequence in Y admits a block basis of n -averages equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0 . S_n has property- $S(n)$.

References

- [BL] B. Beauzamy and J.-T. Lapresté, *Modèles étalés des espaces de Banach*, Travaux en Cours, Hermann, Paris (1984).
- [CKT] P.G. Casazza, N.J. Kalton and L. Tzafriri, *Decompositions of Banach lattices into direct sums*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **304** (1987), 771–800.
- [HOR] R. Haydon, E. Odell and H. Rosenthal, *On certain classes of Baire-1 functions with applications to Banach space theory*, preprint.
- [J] W.B. Johnson, *On quotients of L_p which are quotients of ℓ_p* , Compositio Math. **34** (1977), 69–89.
- [Ja] R.C. James, *Uniformly non-square Banach spaces*, Ann. of Math. **80** (1964), 542–550.
- [JZ1] W.B. Johnson and M. Zippin, *On subspaces of quotients of $(\sum G_n)_{\ell_p}$ and $(\sum G_n)_{c_0}$* , Israel J. Math. **13** (1972), 311–316.
- [JZ2] W.B. Johnson and M. Zippin, *Subspaces and quotients of $(\sum G_n)_{\ell_p}$ and $(\sum G_n)_{c_0}$* , Israel J. Math. **17** (1974), 50–55.
- [LT1] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, “Classical Banach Spaces I,” Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977.
- [LT2] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, “Classical Banach Spaces II,” Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979.
- [MR] B. Maurey and H. Rosenthal, *Normalized weakly null sequences with no unconditional subsequence*, Studia Math. **61** (1977), 77–98.
- [O] E. Odell, *A normalized weakly null sequence with no shrinking subsequence in a Banach space not containing ℓ_1* , Composite Math. **41** (1980), 287–295.
- [R] H. Rosenthal, *Some aspects of the subspace structure of infinite dimensional Banach spaces*, in “Approximation Theory and Functional Analysis” (ed. C. Chuy), Academic Press, 1990.
- [S] J. Schreier, *Ein Gegenbeispiel zur Theorie der schwachen Konvergenz*, Studia Math. **2** (1930), 58–62.
- [Sc] T. Schlumprecht, private communication.
- [Z] M. Zippin, *Banach spaces with separable duals*,